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### **1NC (1/5)**

#### Ocean consumption happening now.

Velasco 14 (Andres Velsaco, Professor of Professional Practice in International Development at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs, “The Lawless Sea”, July 11, 2014, The Daily Star, <http://www.thedailystar.net/the-lawless-sea-32782>) lrm

THE rule of law is almost entirely absent, with virtually no governance or policing. Illegal, unreported, and unregulated economic activities are common. The powerful seize non-renewable resources at the expense of the powerless. Environmental degradation is on the rise. That may sound like a description of a failed state, a desperately poor country beset by civil war, or a fictional dystopia. But it is none of the above. The vast region (45% of the earth's total surface) with next to no governance or rule of law is the high seas—nearly two-thirds of the global ocean that lies outside of any country's jurisdiction. How is this possible? After all, there is the legally binding 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which has been ratified by 166 states and the European Union. When UNCLOS was negotiated, the high seas were protected because they were inaccessible. But technological advances have enabled the exploitation of resources to extend farther and deeper than ever before. Fishing vessels can now operate across the ocean, and deep-sea drilling provides a growing proportion of our oil and gas. UNCLOS has not kept pace with these developments. Industries and activities such as fisheries, shipping, and seabed mining are all regulated separately. No governance framework is in place for emerging high-seas industries such as energy production. Transparency and accountability are weak, and there is little enforcement of rules. Moreover, the authorities have limited power to intercept vessels suspected of illegal activity. As a result, international cooperation to counter illegal fishing, smuggling of weapons and drugs, human trafficking, piracy, and the use of vessels in terrorist operations has been greatly hampered. The consequences are dire. The ocean is our planet's life-support-system, keeping it healthy and productive. But overfishing and pollution are causing tremendous damage. Marine debris causes the death by drowning, suffocation, or starvation of some one million seabirds and around 100,000 marine mammals (seals, whales, and dolphins) every year, not to mention the hazard posed to shipping by sea junk. Plastic pollution -- including pellets and micro plastics that enter food chains and can endanger human health -- is a growing problem. Likewise, rising temperatures are reducing the ocean's oxygen-carrying capacity. The increasing uptake of carbon dioxide is causing ocean acidification and unprecedented changes in chemical and physical conditions, which in turn are affecting marine organisms and ecosystems. The very life of the global ocean is under threat.

### 1NC (2/5)

Your view on resource consumption in terms of efficiency destroys sustainability focus.

Princen 3 (Thomas, associate professor at the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment, “Principles for Sustainability: From Cooperation and Efficiency to Sufficiency”, Global Environmental Politics, Volume 3, Number 1, February 2003, pp 45-46) lrm

In their heyday, the risks of such endeavors were only foregone opportunities, investments and discoveries that someone else would get to first. In an ecologically “empty world,” a world in which human impact is miniscule relative to the extent and regenerative capacity of resources and waste sinks, there were, after all, always more forests to cut, more swamps to drain, more grasslands to plow. For the entrepreneurs and pioneers, being resourceful meant getting the most from nature’s bounty, using resources efficiently to be sure, but for immediate gains, for the power or for the sheer pleasure of playing high-stakes games, but not for long-term sustenance. Mistakes might bring financial ruin but resources abounded elsewhere. One just had to pack up and move on. There was always another frontier. The risks are different now, profoundly serious from the individual to the societal to the global levels, from daily survival for some to successful reproduction for others. Not only are there few true frontiers left but the biophysical underpinnings of human life are in jeopardy. The litany of issues—global warming, extinctions, bioaccumulative toxics, water shortage—is long, well known, and well documented. More of the same, however cooperative, however fine-tuned to be efficient, even “eco-efficient,” will not reverse the trends. In fact, in an ecologically “full world” every incremental increase jeopardizes life-support systems. Squeezing out yet another production efficiency, even in the spirit of cooperation, is of little benefit if throughput still increases.21 Different social organizing principles are desperately needed, ones that are inherently attentive to risks, especially those risks that are displaced in time and place. Sufficiency principles such as restraint, precautionary, polluter pays, zero, and reverse onus, have the virtue of partially resurrecting well-established notions like moderation and thrift, ideas that have never completely disappeared but have only become subordinate to efficiency. They also have the virtue of being highly congruent with global ecological constraint, a congruence not shared by efficiency, and its operational sub-principles, specialization and mobility. By asking how much is enough and how much is too much, one necessarily asks what are the risks, not just in the short term and for the immediate beneficiaries, but what are the risks to those unlikely to realize the benefits, both for the immediate and the long-term.

### 1NC (3/5)

#### **Consumption causes resource depletion, global warming, biodiversity loss, and extinction – sustainability is key.**

Brahic 7 (Catherine, Environment reporter at the New Scientist, “Unsustainable development 'puts humanity at risk'”, 10/25/2007, <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn12834-unsustainable-development-puts-humanity-at-risk.html#.U78divldWSo>) lrm

Humans are completely living beyond their ecological means, says a major report published by the UN Environment Programme on Thursday. The 550-page document finds the human ecological footprint is on average 21.9 hectares per person. Given the global population, however, the Earth's biological capacity is just 15.7 hectares per person. The report is UNEP's latest on the state of the planet's health, taking five years in the making. It was put together by about 390 experts and peer-reviewed by an additional 1000. It reviews the state of Earth's natural resources, from the atmosphere and water, to land surfaces and biodiversity. It concludes that instead of being used and maintained as a tool for the sustainable development of human populations, the environment is being sucked dry by unsustainable development. Examples of how humans are over-exploiting natural resources to their own detriment include: •Water - by 2025, 1.6 billion people will live in countries with absolute water scarcity; 440 million school days are already missed every year because of diarrhoeal diseases. •Land use - modern agriculture exploits land more intensively than it has in the past. In 1987, a hectare of cropland yielded on average 1.8 tonnes of crops, today the same hectare produces 2.5 tonnes. This increased productivity comes at a cost - overexploited land is degraded and becomes less productive. •Fish - 2.6 billion people rely on fish for more than 20% of their animal protein intake, yet as the intensity of fishing increases, the biodiversity of the ocean and the ocean's capacity to produce more fish decreases. •Air - more than 2 million people die each year because of indoor and outdoor pollution. The individual average footprint of 21.9 hectares per person estimated by UNEP, includes the areas required to produce the resources we use, as well as the areas needed to process our waste. "About half of the footprint is accounted for by the areas that are required to absorb our greenhouse gas emissions," says Neville Ash of the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, underlying the scale of the climate change problem. "The other half is the land which produces our food, the forests which produce our timber, the oceans and rivers which produce our fish." The inflated size of the footprint, says Ash, is partially the result of the growth of the human population. The population is currently estimated at 6.7 billion people, and is expected to reach 8 to 10 billion by 2050. But for Ash, the main driver of the size of our footprint is our unsustainable consumption. "There is no doubt that we could sustain the current and projected population if we lived sustainably," he told New Scientist. According to the report authors, energy efficiency is key to sustainability. Johan Kuylenstierna of the Stockholm Environment Institute says that the growth of greenhouse gas emissions in developing nations could be halved by 2020 simply by using existing technologies for energy efficiency. According to Jo Alcamo, at the University of Kassel in Germany, who led the group which looked at future development for the report, open borders and free trade could also be important. In models of the future where trade between countries is made simpler, technologies that improve the sustainable use of resources are adopted more quickly. "Much of the 'natural' capital upon which so much of the human wellbeing and economic activity depends - water, land, the air and atmosphere, biodiversity and marine resources - continue their seemingly inexorable decline," warns Achim Steiner, UNEP executive director. "The cost of inaction and the price humanity will eventually pay is likely to dwarf the cost of swift and decisive action now."

### 1NC (4/5)

#### The alternative is to reject the aff.

#### An ideological shift in the way we approach consumption is key to solve. Your short-term environmental focus treats the symptoms, not the cause of consumption.

Princen 3 (Thomas, associate professor at the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment, “Principles for Sustainability: From Cooperation and Efficiency to Sufficiency”, Global Environmental Politics, Volume 3, Number 1, February 2003, pp 35-36) lrm

Analytic and policy approaches to environmental problems can be roughly grouped into two categories. Adherents to environmental improvement take current resource use practices as given and look for marginal improvements. The time frame is immediate or short term and the scale of activity follows political boundaries. “The environment” is seen as being “out there,” as separate from humans; it is benign and resilient, indeed bountiful, something to be managed for optimal human use. Environmental improvement is the goal, doing better than present conditions, even if “better” is only slowing the rate of degradation. Because crises are rare and localized, incremental social change is needed, if at all. By contrast, there are those who presume current practices are unsustainable, even catastrophic if pursued to their logical conclusions. The starting point for these advocates of sustainability is not the status quo environment but ecological integrity. Their orientation is long term, even very long term, that is, over many generations of key species, including humans. The scale is determined in the first instance by biophysical processes. From this view, human and natural systems may be separate, but the focus is on the intersection of the two systems. Perceived crises demand alternative forms of social organization, ones that make transformational, not marginal, change. Research within the economic strands of social science disciplines such as political science, sociology, and anthropology has been preponderantly in the “environmental improvement” category. Pollution control, environmental movements, and environmental organizations are common topics. At the same time that social science has focused on environmental improvement, those who chart biophysical trends say incremental change is not enough. Every time a “state of the environment” report comes out, authors call for a fundamental shift in how humans relate to nature. Some call for global citizenship, others for spiritual awakening. But nearly all call for a drastic overhaul of the current economic system, a system that is inherently and uncontrollably expansionist, that depends on ever-increasing throughput of material and energy, that risks lifesupport systems for humans and other species. They call, in short, for transformational change, what I have put in the category of sustainability. And, then, the best prescriptions these analysts, who largely are not students of human behavior, come up with are better information, greater efficiencies, more public participation and, for specific measures, new taxes and subsidies—all classic marginal tinkering. If the social sciences are going to make a contribution that is commensurate with the severity of biophysical trends, it must do better than analyze environmental improvement measures. Social scientists must develop analytic tools for the analyst (biophysical and social alike) and an effective vocabulary for the policy maker and activist that allow, indeed encourage, an escape from well-worn prescriptions that result in marginal change at best. Among those tools are norms and principles consonant with critical environmental threats.

### **1NC (5/5)**

To promote alternative normative goals—e.g., human security through an economy that respects natural limits, an economy that is sensitive to overconsumption—the focus must change from

producing goods (goods are good so more goods must be better) to consumption, not just purchasing, so called “demand,” but to consuming, using up, diminishing regenerative capacity, engendering irreversibilities and non-substitutabilities.3 Global water management illustrates the need for such a focus.

### Link: State-centric Politics

#### State-based politics and skepticism of the alt ignores a sustainable relationship with the environment and props up consumption.

Jaques 6 [Peter, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Central Florida where he teaches sustainability and global environmental politics, “The Reguarding of Modernity”: Environmental Skepticism as a Struggle of Citizenship” Global Environmental Politics, 6.1, 2006, Muse]

Knowing that skepticism is part of a political movement, and in order to better understand what this movement means, we are forced to ask the question "for what purpose"? Why dismiss biodiversity loss or global warming? At first it may appear to be a case of simple short term profiteering, or the desire for piecemeal legislation. However, much more is at stake because threats to sustainability threaten the plausibility, as Pirages puts it, of the dominant "constellation of common values, beliefs, and shared wisdom about the physical and social environments," or the dominant social paradigm (DSP).79 What is at stake is the legitimacy of the status quo of world politics nestled in our dominant core civic paradigm of Enlightenment liberalism that keeps the structure of obligations national and market based. Consequently, this struggle automatically includes the modern institutions of the state system and world capitalism that accompany the DSP. An alternative paradigm that sees humanity as a civic member with rights and obligations to the community of life on earth writ large (nature in an international/global sense) is pressuring the modern frame of the world that is embodied in the DSP, and skepticism has been marshaled from contemporary conservatism to defend it. Environmental scholars have long warned that, "At the root of the ecological crisis ... are the basic values which have built our society," and that our current dominant social value system is ecologically maladaptive and in need of paradigmatic change.80 These core values are important because, even though they do not ensure total adherence, they do guide and institutionalize individual and social action. At the world politics level, they guide our most embedded institutions in the state system and world capitalism through "economism."81 More importantly, since, as Dunlap and Van Liere assert, "core cultural values and beliefs are important determinants of individuals' beliefs, values, and [End Page 91] attitudes,"82 these core values may serve to "discipline" citizens to accept and reproduce what Bill Hipwell aptly has named "industria"—the modern comprehensive and predatory world system of knowledge and power that includes the world state system, world military apparati, and world capitalism (among other nodes).83 In other words, the DSP serves as a universal cultural policing mechanism to ensure compliance with the most powerful world political forces that remain relatively invisible in our daily lives, so long as we acquiesce. In Gramscian terms, the DSP provides a hegemonic discourse that mediates human-nature relations in mechanical and managerial terms for economistic exploitation.84 Increasing attention to the contradictions between industria and sustainability may be operating as a (resilient), if fragmented, counter-hegemonic discourse, and environmental skepticism appears to be organized to disintegrate and "outcast" ecological resistance and resistors.85 If this is the case, skepticism is more than a defense of profiteering; indeed, it is a defense against an impending cognitive and cultural revolution that would change the way material power is concentrated and accumulated.

### Link: Neoliberalism (1/2)

#### The aff’s celebration of “market logic” and “economic development” reverses sustainability-focus and expands capital-based imperialism.

Mahmud ’11 (Tayyad, Professor of Law and Director, Center for Global Justice, Seattle University School of Law, “Surplus Humanity" and the Margins of Legality: Slums, Slumdogs, and Accumulation by Dispossession”, Chapman Law Review, 14 Chap. L. Rev. 2 2010-2011)

The neoliberal project aims to unfold a new social order across the globe to reverse the setbacks that the economic power and political hegemony of the wealth-owning classes had suffered on account of Keynesian welfare in the West, socialism in Eastern Europe, and nationalism in the global South.130 Neoliberalism makes increasing recourse to the law to displace Keynesian welfare states through liberalization, deregulation, and privatization, and uses the discipline of expanded markets to remove barriers to accumulation that earlier democratic gains had achieved.131 To secure unfettered rights to private property and profits, it expands and deepens the logic of the market, collapses the distinctions between culture and economy, undermines state sovereignty and national autonomy, and links local and global political economies to facilitate transnational accumulation of capital.132 Through new regimes of trade, finance, and property rights, the sovereignty of states transfers to international institutions dominated by hegemonic states. 133 The hidden hand of the market continues to work in concert with the iron fist of the state in the service of accumulation by dispossession. Explosive growth of slums and slum-dwellers is a direct result. Neoliberalism does not displace the state as much as it reformulates it and restructures its options.134 The neoliberal project is to turn the "nation-state" into a "market-state," 135 one with the primary agenda of facilitating global capital accumulation unburdened by any legal regulations aimed at assuring the welfare of citizens. Social formations in the global South, situated in an asymmetrical relationship with global capitalism, are a particular target of this project. The neoliberal regimes, with their bedrock principles of private property rights and free trade, are a coercive mechanism to get states in the global South to adopt neoliberal economic and social policy frames conducive to global capital.136 The enabling mechanism is "[tlhe extension of the normative force of international standards by the device of conditionality."137 These regimes advance particular understandings of development and poverty that "disregard[] the social context of provision, the lived experiences of the poor and dismiss[] and/or reinforce[] the way in which deprivations are constituted."138 The mandate is to privatize public assets, roll back social services, and allow unbridled mobility of capital.139 Now "[s]trait-jacketed within the global logic of capital and market and the global regime of property rights," states in the global South "can no longer act as developmental states and engage in management of poverty on their own."140 Instead, non-state actors representing interests of global capital play an active role in designing legal orders that circumscribe state sovereignty and autonomy. 141 Mandates of privatization make education, health, infrastructure, utilities, housing, and a range of state enterprises available for private appropriation.142 By its insistence on the rollback of the state, privatization becomes "[t]he [c]utting [e]dge of [a]ccumulation by [d]ispossession."143 Rapid urban growth triggered by globalized economic circuits, along with diminished state capacities and resulting civil strife, is the recipe for mushrooming slums in the global South.144 The unprecedented urban expansion fueled by deregulated financial capital produced another bout of "[c]reative [d]estruction"145 where the marginalized and underprivileged bear the brunt. Destruction of traditional rural economies, restructuring of the agricultural sector, and deeper penetration of market forces into rural societies, accelerated migration of uprooted rural farmers to urban areas. 146 As interests of global finance capital took precedence over survival needs of the poor, the impact on the vulnerable was quick, and the "main single cause of increases in poverty and inequality during the 1980s and 1990s was the retreat of the state."47 A United Nations Human Development Report found that "[a]n unprecedented number of countries saw development slide backwards in the 1990s. In forty-six countries people are poorer today than in 1990. In twenty-five countries

### **Link: Neoliberalism (2/2)**

more people go hungry today than a decade ago."148 While "burdens of survival" increased for all poor, "those of women are even greater."149

### Link: Economy

#### Economic logic only props up the capitalist system that perpetuates consumption, causing systemic violence and war.

**Giroux** **6**

(Henry, “Dirty Democracy and State Terrorism: The Politics of the New Authoritarianism in the United States” Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East 26.2 (2006) 163-177) BSH

As the state of emergency, in Giorgio Agamben's aptly chosen words, becomes the rule rather than the exception, a number of powerful antidemocratic tendencies threaten the prospects for both American and global democrac**y**.[10](http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2115/journals/comparative_studies_of_south_asia_africa_and_the_middle_east/v026/26.2giroux.html" \l "FOOT10#FOOT10) The first is a market fundamentalism that not only trivializes democratic values and public concerns but also enshrines a rabid individualism, an all-embracing quest for profits, and a social Darwinism in which misfortune is seen as a weakness—the current sum total being the Hobbesian rule of a "war of all against all" that replaces any vestige of shared responsibilities or compassion for others. The values of the market and the ruthless workings of finance capital become the template for organizing the rest of society. Everybody is now a customer or client, and every relationship is ultimately judged in bottom-line, cost-effective terms as the neoliberal mantra "privatize or perish" is repeated over and over again. Responsible citizens are replaced by an assemblage of entrepreneurial subjects, each tempered in the virtue of self-reliance and forced to face the increasingly difficult challenges of the social order alone. Freedom is no longer about securing equality, social justice, or the public welfare but about unhampered trade in goods, financial capital, and commodities. As the logic of capital trumps democratic sovereignty, low-intensity warfare at home chips away at democratic freedoms, and high-intensity warfare abroad delivers democracy with bombs, tanks, and chemical warfare. The global cost of these neoliberal commitments is massive human suffering and death, delivered not only in the form of bombs and the barbaric practices of occupying armies but also in structural adjustment policies in which the drive for land, resources, profits, and goods are implemented by global financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Global lawlessness and armed violence accompany the imperative of free trade, the virtues of a market without boundaries, and the promise of a Western-style democracy imposed through military solutions, ushering in the age of rogue sovereignty on a global scale. Under such conditions, human suffering and hardship reach unprecedented levels of intensity. In a rare moment of truth, Thomas Friedman, the columnist for the New York Times, precisely argued for the use of U.S. power—including military force—to support this antidemocratic world order. He claimed that "the hidden hand of the market will never work without the hidden fist. . . . And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies to flourish is called the US Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps."[11](http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2115/journals/comparative_studies_of_south_asia_africa_and_the_middle_east/v026/26.2giroux.html" \l "FOOT11#FOOT11) As Mark Rupert points out, "In Friedman's twisted world, if people are to realize their deepest aspirations—the longing for a better life which comes from their very souls—they must stare down the barrel of Uncle Sam's gun."[12](http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2115/journals/comparative_studies_of_south_asia_africa_and_the_middle_east/v026/26.2giroux.html" \l "FOOT12#FOOT12) As neoliberals in the Bush administration implement policies at home to reduce taxation and regulation while spending billions on wars abroad, they slash funds that benefit the sick, the elderly, the poor, and young people. But **pu**blic resources are diverted not only from crucial domestic problems ranging from poverty and unemployment to hunger; they are also diverted from addressing the fate of some 45 million children in "the world's poor countries [who] will die needlessly over the next decade," as reported by the British-based group Oxfam.[13](http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2115/journals/comparative_studies_of_south_asia_africa_and_the_middle_east/v026/26.2giroux.html" \l "FOOT13#FOOT13) The U.S. commitment to market fundamentalism elevates profits over human needs and consequently offers few displays of compassion, aid, or relief for millions of poor and abandoned children in the world who do not have adequate shelter, who are severely hungry, who have no access to health care or safe water, and who succumb needlessly to the ravages of AIDS and other diseases.[14](http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2115/journals/comparative_studies_of_south_asia_africa_and_the_middle_east/v026/26.2giroux.html" \l "FOOT14#FOOT14) For instance, as Jim Lobe points out, "U.S. foreign aid in 2003 ranked dead last among all wealthy nations. In fact, its entire development aid spending in 2003 came to only ten percent of what it spent on the Iraq war that year. U.S. development assistance comes to less than one-fortieth of its annual defense budget."[15](http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2115/journals/comparative_studies_of_south_asia_africa_and_the_middle_east/v026/26.2giroux.html" \l "FOOT15#FOOT15) Carol Bellamy, the executive director of UNICEF, outlines the consequences of the broken promises to children by advanced capitalist countries such as the United States.

### Impact: Extinction (1/2)

#### The aff’s environmental skepticism dooms humanity to extinction – only a shift in relationship towards our relationship with the earth solves.

Jaques 6[Peter, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Central Florida where he teaches sustainability and global environmental politics, “The Reguarding of Modernity”: Environmental Skepticism as a Struggle of Citizenship” Global Environmental Politics, 6.1, 2006, Muse]

Environmental skepticism presents itself as "speaking truth to power" through contrarian claims they say objectively "debunk" the myths of the environmental movement and environmental science. Yet, the analysis of this literature indicates that environmental skepticism is specifically issued from a conservative ideology supported by a coherent conservative countermovement opposed to environmentalism. This positions the bias of skeptic knowledge claims, and while environmentalists' claims clearly have their own bias, the claim that the [End Page 94] skeptical project is generated from a sense of objectivity and value neutrality is flatly rejected as part of an attempt to subvert reflexive interrogation and the implied counter-hegemonic resistance this entails. In particular, environmental skepticism is opposed to the establishment of global environmental concerns and those related to human sustainability. The substantive arguments of environmental skeptics are guided by a "deep anthropocentrism" which dissolves society from non-human nature. Importantly, a severed nature-human relationship effectively challenges the institutionalization of obligation to environmental changes and the people who are affected by these changes. Skepticism therefore preserves a conservative hope for limited government in the global market while it protects a consumptive elite against responsibilities for these systemic changes. In the process, environmental skepticism defends the structure of dominant social values in world politics such as the state system, expansive resource exploitation under world capitalism, and a hegemonic and consumptive North (and US in particular from where most skeptics hail) to flourish unmolested by the gadflies of the environmental movement. Therefore, being overly concerned with the contrarian knowledge claims of environmental skeptics misses skepticism's more important political message about duty and the legitimacy of public environmental concern. Environmental skeptics, even if they are conclusively proven wrong on all counts, will succeed in—at least temporarily—guarding a falling hegemonic order if academia, the press, and government become overly interested in Darth Vader and Obi Wan dueling at the bay doors.101 I suspect that skeptics will be happy to continue to create this kind of conflict because it ultimately provides an indefinite defense of the dominant social norms and institutions. They do not need to win the debate about the state of the world to maintain this power and dominance. They only need to establish enough doubt about the environmental epistemic community having the debate to throw public action into doubt as well. Kysar, in Ecology Law Quarterly, notes that both environmentalists, such as Worldwatch Institute, and skeptics like Lomborg are guilty of hyperbole which they use to focus attention on their own policy agenda through competing Litanies.102 These Litanies are, among other things, struggles over the ability to frame risk, and therefore regulation: As a result, science becomes a contested space in which competitors vie forthe legal authority to impose costs on other parties, whether in the form of regulatory compliance, or externalized physical and environmental harms.103 However, Wildavsky, correctly I think, argues that risk is politically assessed by morality, and this makes the framing of public risk a civic exercise.104 From here, [End Page 95] he argues that environmental policies need to be made with a preponderance of evidence, not evidence from probabilities. But skeptical ethics severely limit what counts and is available to create such a preponderance of evidence. Thus, contrary to what Lomborg argues, understanding what is to be done and prioritizing action is not just a simple matter of adding up the costs and benefits. The real struggle is over what can count as a cost or benefit or even whether such a conceptual tool is fair, appropriate, or relevant.105 Environmental skepticism is therefore a struggle over the core values and beliefs that frame who and what risks should count as important. But these are no ordinary historical risks. The state of the world debate centers on what core civic values should organize risk in society regarding human development and progress. Wildavsky's "culture" model is based on core fears and different cultural sets have different core fears of risks, and that environmentalists have a specific culture guided by "radical egalitarianism." I do not disagree that some environmentalism is deeply concerned about the fair distribution of ecological space and change.106 Turning this around though, it is just as plausible to frame skeptics as struggling for a "radical in-egalitarianism" within the core values that already organize world politics. In conclusion, skepticism's influence in politics and culture presents a dramatic threat to human ability and political will to protect the critical life support systems found in ecological goods and services because they dismiss these systems as important. Many civilizations have actively decided, for one reason or another, to ignore the erosion of this essential relationship between society and

### Impact: Extinction (2/2)

non-human nature, only to collapse or find themselves at the mercy of a Dark Age that is defined by misery and suffering.107 Jared Diamond writes, Our world is interconnected and interdependent, like Easter Island's 11 clans. Today, we face the same

problems—loss of forests, fisheries, biodiversity, fresh water, and topsoil—that dragged down past societies. But for the first time in world history, we are producing or transporting toxic materials, greenhouse gases, and alien species. All these environmental problems are time bombs. The world is now on an unsustainable course, and these problems will be resolved one way or another, pleasantly or unpleasantly, within the next 50 years.108 Yet, Lomborg shrugs off the matter of accountability to exactly these kinds of changes as "blame" and says our true priorities should be more along the lines of a low-fat diet instead of "focusing on pesticides, oxygen depletion, global warming, forests, wind power, biodiversity, etc.—issues which are more clearly someone else's fault."109 [End Page 96] To some, the song of skepticism sounds like a sweet song, laden with the security and power of modernity. Diamond points out with optimism I share, when Easter Island collapsed, it did not have the benefit of knowing that other societies had collapsed by undermining ecological life support systems. However, taking responsibility for global environmental integrity would be a positive step towards paradigmatic and r/evolutionary changes, one of which would be an incorporation of obligations to human societies commensurate with membership and impact within a larger international and ecological community.110 This directly challenges the way power and wealth are concentrated in the current world system, and environmental skeptics have organized as the rearguard for this system and its globalizing—but beleaguered—paradigm. To be sure, the fact that conservatives have felt the need to rally around the DSP indicates that the ecological position is gaining strength. Skeptics however wish to postpone this change. Their placations sound good to the elite who are part of the dominant world order. From Diamond's lessons, this skeptical song is like lulling the boiling frog to sleep, ignoring that someone put the frog in the pot to begin with, and then telling the frog that things are, "in fact," getting better all the time
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#### Capitalism is quickly approaching an ‘ecological Armageddon’ – a global environmental crisis manifesting in uncontrollable climate change, ocean acidification, water shortages, all culminating in planetary extinction

Foster & Clark 12

(John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, and Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at the University of Utah., “The Planetary Emergency,” Monthly Review, December 2012, vol. 64, issue 7) BSH

Capitalism today is caught in a seemingly **e**ndless crisis, with economic stagnation and upheaval circling the globe.1 But while the world has been fixated on the economic problem, global environmental conditions have been rapidly worsening, confronting humanity with its ultimate crisis: one of long-term survival. The common source of both of these crises resides in the process of capital accumulation. Likewise the common solution is to be sought in a “revolutionary reconstitution of society at large,” going beyond the regime of capital.2¶ It is still possible for humanity to avert what economist Robert Heilbroner once called “ecological Armageddon.”3 The means for the creation of a just and sustainable world currently exist, and are to be found lying hidden in the growing gap between what could be achieved with the resources already available to us, and what the prevailing social order allows us to accomplish. It is this latent potential for a quite different human metabolism with nature that offers the master-key to a workable ecological exit strategy.¶ The Approaching Ecological Precipice¶ Science today tells us that we have a generation at most in which to carry out a radical transformation in our economic relations, and our relations with the earth, if we want to avoid a major tipping point or “point of no return,” after which vast changes in the earth’s climate will likely be beyond our ability to prevent and will be irreversible.4 At that point it will be impossible to stop the ice sheets in Antarctica and Greenland from continuing to melt, and thus the sea level from rising by as much as “tens of meters.”5 Nor will we be able to prevent the Arctic sea ice from vanishing completely in the summer months, or carbon dioxide and methane from being massively released by the decay of organic matter currently trapped beneath the permafrost—both of which would represent positive feedbacks dangerously accelerating climate change. Extreme weather events will become more and more frequent and destructive. An article in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences demonstrated that the record-breaking heat wave that hit the Moscow area in 2010 with disastrous effect was made five times more likely, in the decade ending in that year as compared with earlier decades, due to the warming trend, implying “an approximate 80% probability” that it “would not have occurred without climate warming.” Other instances of extreme weather such as the deadly European heat wave in 2003 and the serious drought in Oklahoma and Texas in 2011, have been shown to be connected to earth warming. Hurricane Sandy, which devastated much of New York and New Jersey at the end of October 2012, was impacted and amplified to a considerable extent by climate change.6¶ The point of irreversible climate change is usually thought of as a 2°C (3.6°F) increase in global average temperature, which has been described as equivalent at the planetary level to the “cutting down of the last palm tree” on Easter Island. An increase of 2°C in global average temperature coincides roughly with cumulative carbon emissions of around one trillion metric tons. Based on past emissions trends it is predicted by climate scientists at Oxford University that we will hit the one trillion metric ton mark in 2043, or thirty-one years from now. We could avoid emitting the trillionth metric ton if we were to reduce our carbon emissions beginning immediately by an annual rate of 2.4 percent a year.7¶ To be sure, climate science is not exact enough to pinpoint precisely how much warming will push us past a planetary tipping point.8 But all the recent indications are that if we want to avoid planetary disaster we need to stay considerably below 2°C. As a result, almost all governments have signed on to staying below 2°C as a goal at the urging of the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. More and more, 2°C has come to symbolize the reality of a planetary point of no return. In this sense, all the discussions of what the climate will be like if the world warms to 3°C, or all the way to 6°C, are relatively meaningless.9 Before such temperatures are attained, we will have already reached the limits of our ability to control the climate- change process, and we will then be left with the task of adapting to apocalyptic ecological conditions. Already Arctic sea ice experienced a record melt in the summer of 2012 with some scientists predicting an ice-free Arctic in the summer as early as 2016–2020. In the words of James Hansen, the world’s leading climatologist, we are facing a “planetary emergency”—since if we approach 2°C “we will have started a process that is out of humanity’s control.”10¶ Given all of this, actually aiming for the one trillion metric ton mark in cumulative carbon emissions, or a 2°C increase in global temperature, would be courting long-term disaster. Some prominent climate analysts have proposed a target of staying below 750 billion cumulative metric tons of carbon—estimated to provide a 75 percent chance of staying below the climate-change tipping point. At current rates of carbon emissions it is calculated that we will reach the 750 billion metric tons mark in 2028, or sixteen years. We could avoid emitting the 750 billionth metric ton if we were to reduce our carbon emissions beginning immediately at an average annual rate of 5.3 percent.11 To get some perspective on this, the Stern Review on The Economics of Climate Change issued by the British government in 2007, which is generally seen as representing the progressive side of the carbon debate, argued that a reduction in emissions of more than a 1 percent annual rate would generate a severe crisis for the capitalist
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economy and hence was unthinkable.12¶ Many thought that the Great Financial Crisis would result in a sharp curtailment of carbon emissions, helping to limit global warming. Carbon emissions dipped by 1.4 percent in 2009, but this brief decline was more than offset by a record 5.9 percent growth of carbon emissions in 2010, even as the world economy as a whole continued to stagnate. This rapid increase has been attributed primarily to the increasing fossil-fuel intensity of the world economy, and to the continued expansion of emerging economies, notably China.13¶ In an influential article published in Nature Climate Change, “Asymmetric Effects of Economic Decline on CO2 Emissions,” Richard York used data for over 150 countries between 1960 and 2008 to demonstrate that carbon dioxide emissions do not decline in the same proportion in an economic downturn as they increase in an economic upturn. Thus for each 1 percent in the growth of GDP per capita, carbon emissions grew by 0.733 percent, whereas for each 1 percent drop in GDP, carbon emissions fell by only 0.430 percent. These asymmetric effects can be attributed to built-in infrastructural conditions—factories, transportation networks, and homes—meaning that these structures do not disappear during recessions and continue to influence fossil-fuel consumption. It follows of necessity that a boom-and-bust economic system cannot reduce carbon emissions; that can only be achieved by an economy that reduces such emissions on a steady basis along with changes in the infrastructure of production and society in general.14¶ Indeed, there is reason to believe that there is a strong pull on capitalism in its current monopoly-finance phase to seek out more fossil-fuel intensive forms of production the more deeply it falls into the stagnation trap, resulting in repeated attempts to restart the growth engine by, in effect, giving it more gas. According to the Low Carbon Index, the carbon intensity of world production fell by 0.8 percent in 2009, and by 0.7 percent in 2010. However, in 2011 the carbon intensity of world production rose by 0.6 percent. “The economic recovery, where it has occurred, has been dirty.”15 The notion that a stagnant-prone capitalist growth economy (what Herman Daly calls a “failed growth economy”) would be even more intensively destructive of the environment was a thesis advanced as early as 1976 by the pioneering Marxist environmental sociologist Charles H. Anderson. As Anderson put it, “as the threat of stagnation mounts, so does the need for throughput in order to maintain tolerable growth rates.”16¶ The hope of many that peak crude oil production and the end of cheap oil would serve to limit carbon emissions has also proven false. It is clear that in the age of enhanced worldwide coal production, fracking, and tar sands oil there is no shortage of carbon with which to heat up the planet. Today’s known stocks of oil, coal, and gas reserves are at least five times the planet’s remaining carbon budget, amounting to 2.8 gigatons in carbon potential, and the signs are that the capitalist system intends to burn it all.17 As Bill McKibben observed in relation to these fossil-fuel reserves: “Yes, this coal and oil is still technically in the soil. But it’s already economically aboveground.”18 Corporations and governments count these carbon resources as financial assets, which means they are intended for exploitation. Not too long ago environmentalists were worried about the world running out of fossil fuels (especially crude oil); now this has been inverted by climate-change concerns.¶ As bad as the climate crisis is, however, it is important to understand that it is only a part of the larger global ecological crisis—since climate change is merely one among a number of dangerous rifts in planetary boundaries arising from human transformations of the earth. Ocean acidification, destruction of the ozone layer, species extinction, the disruption of the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, growing fresh water shortages, land-cover change, and chemical pollution all represent global ecological transformations/crises. Already we have crossed the planetary boundaries (designated by scientists based on departure from Holocene conditions) not only in relation to climate change, but also with respect to species extinction and the nitrogen cycle. Species extinction is occurring at about a thousand times the “background rate,” a phenomenon known as the “sixth extinction” (referring back to the five previous periods of mass extinctions in earth history—the most recent of which, 65 million years ago, resulted in the extinction of the dinosaurs). Nitrogen pollution now constitutes a major cause of dead zones in oceans. Other developing planetary rifts, such as ocean acidification (known as the “evil twin” of climate change since it is also caused by carbon emissions), and chronic loss of freshwater supplies, which is driving the global privatization of water, are of growing concern. All of this raises basic questions of survival: the ultimate crisis confronting humanity.19¶ The Ultimate Crisis¶ The scale and speed of the emerging ecological challenge, manifested not only in climate change but also in numerous other planetary rifts, constitutes irrefutable evidence that the root cause of the environmental problem lies in our socioeconomic system, and particularly in the dynamic of capital accumulation.¶ Faced with such intractable problems, the response of the dominant interests has always been
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that technology, supplemented by market magic and population control, can solve all problems, allowing for unending capital accumulation and economic growth without undue ecological effects by means of an absolute decoupling of growth from environmental throughput. Thus, when asked about the problems posed by fossil fuels (including tar sands oil, shale oil and gas, and coal) President Obama responded: “All of us are going to have to work together in an effective way to figure out how we balance the imperative of economic growth with very real concerns about the effect we’re having on our planet. And ultimately I think this can be solved with technology.”20¶ Yet, the dream that technology alone, considered in some abstract sense, can solve the environmental problem, allowing for unending economic growth without undue ecological effects through an absolute decoupling of one from the other, is quickly fading.21 Not only are technological solutions limited by the laws of physics, namely the second law of thermodynamics (which tells us, for example, that energy is partially dissipated upon use), but they are also subject to the laws of capitalism itself.22 Technological change under the present system routinely brings about relative efficiency gains in energy use, reducing the energy and raw material input per unit of output. Yet, this seldom results in absolute decreases in environmental throughput at the aggregate level; rather the tendency is toward the ever-greater use of energy and materials. This is captured by the well-known Jevons paradox, named after the nineteenth-century economist William Stanley Jevons. Jevons pointed out that gains in energy efficiency almost invariably increase the absolute amount of energy used, since such efficiency feeds economic expansion. Jevons highlighted how each new steam engine from Watt’s famous engine on was more efficient in its use of coal than the one before, yet the introduction of each improved steam engine nonetheless resulted in a greater absolute use of coal.23

### Ethics Key

#### **An ethical sustainability is necessary to solve extinction.**

Ikerd 3 [John, Professor agriculture, University of Missouri, “A New Jubilee of Agricultural Sustainability” Presented at Rural Life Day 2003, <http://web.missouri.edu/ikerdj/papers/Jubilee.htm>]

Sustainable farming ultimately is a matter of ethics or morality. Sustainability requires that we leave opportunities for those of future generations for a quality of life equal to or better than the quality of our lives today. There are no economic incentives for sustainability. Those of future generations are unable to reward us economically for the resources we choose to leave for them rather than consume for our own gratification. There are no social incentives for sustainability. We will not be alive during those future generations, and may have no descendents in those generations, to benefit from the positive social relationships that may arise from our investments today in a civil and just society for the future. Ultimately, our concerns for sustainability arise from our sense of moral and ethical responsibility for stewardship of the earth for the benefit of all of life for all times. True stewardship, acting out of concern for others rather than self, arises from the realization that we are a part of something that transcends “us” and transcends “now.” Stewardship reflects a belief that we are but a part of a higher order of things, within which our lives take on purpose and meaning. Our sense of ethics and morality reflect our belief in this higher order, which we cannot change but with which we must conform. Within this order, “right or wrong” and “good or bad” are defined by acts that are either in harmony or in conflict with this order. Our individual purpose in life is defined by our unique place and function within this higher order – through which our lives take on meaning. Our spirituality arises from our belief in this higher order of things, regardless of whether it arises from a belief in the laws of God or the law of nature. Lacking a sense of spirituality, true stewardship is irrational and sustainability is of no concern. Thus, sustainable farming ultimately is a matter of ethics and morality – of spirituality.
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#### The perm is co-opted—causes extinction—the alt alone is key to revolutionary agency

Parr ’13

(Adrian Parr, Adrian philosopher and cultural critic. A specialist on Deleuze, ‘The Wrath of Capital’, 2013, p. 2-5) BSH

The fable provides an intriguing perspective on freedom and autonomy. The golem has no freedom: it is the rabbi who brings it to life and sentences it to death. Yet by returning the creature to earth, the rabbi holds the golem accountable for the destruction it wrought despite not being free. This is the basic premise of this book. We are not free, yet we are autonomous. We are constrained by the historical circumstances into which we are born, along with the institutions and structures that contain us. Nonetheless, each and every one of us also participates in and thereby confirms the legitimacy of those selfsame institutions and structures that dominate us, along with the violence they sustain.3 In this way, we are both the rabbi creator and the creature creation. Insofar as we are socially constituted, we are constrained by the historical and institutional forces that construct us. As political agents, we realize our autonomy as we interrupt and contest the historical and institutional conditions that regulate and organize the frames of reference through which we think and act. This structure of rupture and continuity is the modern narrative par excellence. Fredric Jameson neatly summarizes the narrative condition of modernity as the dialectic between the modality of rupture that inaugurates a new period and the definition of that new period in turn by continuity.4 The ironical outcome, as I describe it in the pages that follow, is that despite the narrative category driving change in the modern world, everything continues to stay the same-perhaps because what this narrative produces is a virulent strain of amnesia. Every change or historical rupture contains within it the dialectical narrative structure of modernity such that the New and the period it launches into existence are mere ritual. What persists is the condition of violence embedded in neoliberal capitalism as it robs each and every one of us (other species and ecosystems included) of a future. The narrative of modernity and the optimistic feeling of newness it generates are merely a distraction. Distractions such as decarbonizing the free-market economy, buying carbon offsets, handing out contraceptives to poor women in developing countries, drinking tap water in place of bottled water, changing personal eating habits, installing green roofs on city hall, and expressing moral outrage at British Petroleum (BP) for the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, although well meaning, are merely symptomatic of the uselessness of free-market "solutions" to environmental change. Indeed, such widespread distraction leads to denial. With the proclamation of the twenty- first century to be the era of climate change, the Trojan horse of neoliberal restructuring entered the political arena of climate change talks and policy, and a more virulent strain of capital accumulation began. For this reason, delegates from the African nations, with the support of the Group of 77 (developing countries), walked out of the 2009 United Nations (UN) climate talks in Copenhagen, accusing rich countries of dragging their heels on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and destroying the mechanism through which this reduction can be achieved-the Ky oto Protocol. In the absence of an internationally birfding agreement on emissions reductions, all individual actions taken to reduce emissions-a flat global carbon tax, recycling, hybrid cars, carbon offsets, a few solar panels here and there, and so on-are mere theatrics. In this book, I argue that underpinning the massive environmental changes happening around the world, of which climate change is an important factor, is an unchanging socioeconomic condition (neoliberal capitalism), and the magnitude of this situation is that of a political crisis. So, at the risk of extending my literary license too far, it is fair to say that the human race is currently in the middle of an earth-shattering historical moment. Glaciers in the Himalayas, Andes, Rockies, and Alps are receding. The social impact of environmental change is now acute, with the International Organization for Migration predicting there will be approximately two hundred million environmental refugees by 2050, with estimates expecting as many as up to one billion.5 We are poised between needing to radically transform how we live and becoming extinct. Modern (postindustrial) society inaugurated what geologists refer to as the ''Anthropocene age;' when human activities began to drive environmental change, replacing the Holocene, which for the previous ten thousand years was the era when the earth regulated the environment. 6 Since then people have been pumping GHGs into the atmosphere at a faster rate than the earth can reabsorb them. If we remain on our current course of global GHG emissions, the earth's average climate will rise 3°C by the end of the twenty-first century (with a 2 to 4.5° probable range of uncertainty) . The warmer the world gets, the less effectively the earth's biological systems can absorb carbon. The
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more the earth's climate heats up, the more carbon dioxide (C02) plants and soils will release; this feedback loop will further increase climate heating. When carbon feedback is factored into the climate equation, climate models predict that the rise in average climate temperature will be 6°C by 2100 (with a 4 to 8°C probable range of uncertainty) .7 For this reason, even if emissions were reduced from now on by approximately 3 percent annually, there is only a fifty-fifty chance that we can stay within the 2°C benchmark set by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 2007. However, given that in 2010 the world's annual growth rate of atmospheric carbon was the largest in a decade, bringing the world's C02 concentrations to 389.6 parts per million (ppm) and pushing concentrations to 39 percent higher than what they were in 1750 at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution (approximately 278 ppm), and that there is no sign of growth slowing, then even the fifty-fifty window of opportunity not to exceed 2°C warming is quickly closing. If we continue at the current rate of GHG emissions growth, we will be on course for a devastating scenario.8 We need to change course now.9 Climate change poses several environmental problems, many of which now have a clear focus. The scientific problem: How can the high amounts of C02 in the atmosphere causing the earth's climate to change be lowered to 350 ppm? The economic problem: How can the economy be decarbonized while addressing global economic disparities? The social problem: How can human societies change their climate-altering behaviors and adapt to changes in climate?10 The cultural problem: How can commodity culture be reigned in? The problem policymakers face: What regulations can be introduced to inhibit environmental degradation, promote GHG reductions, and assist the people, species, and ecosystems most vulnerable to environmental change? The political problem is less clear, however, perhaps because of its philosophical implications. Political philosophy examines how these questions are dealt with and the assumptions upon which they are premised. It studies the myriad ways in which individuals, corporations, the world's leaders, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and communities respond to climate change and the larger issue of environmental change characteristic of the Anthropocene age. More important, political philosophy considers how these responses reinforce social and economic structures of power. In light of this consideration, how do we make the dramatic and necessary changes needed to adapt equitably to environmental change without the economically powerful claiming ownership over the collective impetus and goals that this historical juncture presents? By drawing attention to the political problem of equality in the context of environmental change, I need to stress that I am not a market Luddite; rather, I am critical of the neoliberal paradigm of economic activity that advances deregulation, competition, individualism, and privatization, all the while rolling back on social services and producing widespread inequities and uneven patterns of development and social prosperity. I am also not intending to make negotiable the "non-negotiable planetary preconditions that humanity needs to respect in order to avoid the risk of deleterious or even catastrophic environmental change at continental to global scales:'11 Indeed, my argument is that by focusing too much on free-market solutions to the detriment of the world's most vulnerable (the poor, other species, ecosystems, and future generations), we make these preconditions negotiable: the free market is left to negotiate our future for us.

### **A2: Transition Wars**

#### Transition wars are limited and peaceful and can’t resolve capital’s internal antagonisms.

Mészáros 2008 (István, Prof Emeritus in Philosophy and Political Theory @ U of Sussex The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time, 310-311)

The second blocked avenue is even more important. It concerns the removal of the possibility of solving the system’s aggravating problems through an all-out war, as it was twice attempted in the world wars of the twentieth century. I wrote at the time of the onset of capital’s structural crisis, toward the end of the Vietnam war that: …the system has been decapitated through the removal of its ultimate sanction: an all-out war on its real or potential adversaries…Exporting violence is no longer possible on the required massive scale. Attempts at doing so on a limited scale—like the Vietnam War37—not only are no substitutes for the old mechanism but even accelerate the inevitable internal explosions of the system. Nor is it possible to get away indefinitely with the ideological mystification which represented the internal challenge of socialism: the only possible solution to the present crisis, as an external confrontation: a ‘subversion’ directed from abroad by a ‘monolithic’ enemy. For the first time in history capitalism is globally confronted with its own problems which cannot be ‘postponed’ much longer, nor can they be indeed transferred to the military plane in order to be exported in the form of an all-out war.38 I added in a note to the last sentence that “Of course such a war can happen, but its actual planning and active preparation in the open cannot function as a vital internal stabilizer.”39 This is so even if the neoconservative “vision guys” of the Pentagon—whose “theories” border on insanity40—are more than willing “to think the unthinkable.” But even such extreme forms of irrationality cannot undo the far-reaching implications of this blocked avenue. For the underlying issue is an insoluble contradiction within the reproductive framework of the capital system. A contradiction manifest, on the one hand, through the ongoing relentless concentration and centralization of capital on a global scale, and on the other, through the structurally imposed inability of the capital system to produce the required political stabilization on a global scale. Even the most aggressive military interventions of global hegemonic imperialism—at present those of the United States—in different parts of the planet are bound to fail in this respect. The destructiveness of limited wars, no matter how many, is very far from being enough for imposing everywhere on a lasting basis the unchallengeable rule of a single imperialist hegemon and its “global government”—the only thing that would befit the logic of capital. Only the socialist hegemonic alternative can show a way out of this destructive contradiction. That is, an organizationally viable alternative that fully respects the dialectical complementarity of the national and international in our time.

## Aff Answers

### Permutation Solvency (1/2)

#### **Permutation solves – focusing debates in concrete action is the best way to create new social relations – The permutation causes a reform of neoliberal politics that best solves the K**

Ferguson 11 (Professor of Anthropology at Stanford ‘The Uses of Neoliberalism’, Antipode, Vol. 41, No. S1, pp 166–184)

If we are seeking, as this special issue of Antipode aspires to do, to link our critical analyses to the world of grounded political struggle—not only to interpret the world in various ways, but also to change it—then there is much to be said for focusing, as I have here, on mundane, real- world debates around policy and politics, even if doing so inevitably puts us on the compromised and reformist terrain of the possible, rather than the seductive high ground of revolutionary ideals and utopian desires. But I would also insist that there is more at stake in the examples I have discussed here than simply a slightly better way to ameliorate the miseries of the chronically poor, or a technically superior method for relieving the suffering of famine victims.¶ My point in discussing the South African BIG campaign, for instance, is not really to argue for its implementation. There is much in the campaign that is appealing, to be sure. But one can just as easily identify a series of worries that would bring the whole proposal into doubt. Does not, for instance, the decoupling of the question of assistance from the issue of labor, and the associated valorization of the “informal”, help provide a kind of alibi for the failures of the South African regime to pursue policies that would do more to create jobs? Would not the creation of a basic income benefit tied to national citizenship simply exacerbate the vicious xenophobia that already divides the South African poor,¶ in a context where many of the poorest are not citizens, and would thus not be eligible for the BIG? Perhaps even more fundamentally, is the idea of basic income really capable of commanding the mass support that alone could make it a central pillar of a new approach to distribution? The record to date gives powerful reasons to doubt it. So far, the technocrats’ dreams of relieving poverty through efficient cash transfers have attracted little support from actual poor people, who seem to find that vision a bit pale and washed out, compared with the vivid (if vague) populist promises of jobs and personalistic social inclusion long offered by the ANC patronage machine, and lately personified by Jacob Zuma (Ferguson forthcoming).¶ My real interest in the policy proposals discussed here, in fact, has little to do with the narrow policy questions to which they seek to provide answers. For what is most significant, for my purposes, is not whether or not these are good policies, but the way that they illustrate a process through which specific governmental devices and modes of reasoning that we have become used to associating with a very particular (and conservative) political agenda (“neoliberalism”) may be in the process of being peeled away from that agenda, and put to very different uses. Any progressive who takes seriously the challenge I pointed to at the start of this essay, the challenge of developing new progressive arts of government, ought to find this turn of events of considerable interest.¶ As Steven Collier (2005) has recently pointed out, it is important to question the assumption that there is, or must be, a neat or automatic fit between a hegemonic “neoliberal” political-economic project (however that might be characterized), on the one hand, and specific “neoliberal” techniques, on the other. Close attention to particular techniques (such as the use of quantitative calculation, free choice, and price driven by supply and demand) in particular settings (in Collier’s case, fiscal and budgetary reform in post-Soviet Russia) shows that the relationship between the technical and the political-economic “is much more polymorphous and unstable than is assumed in much critical geographical work”, and that neoliberal technical mechanisms are in fact “deployed in relation to diverse political projects and social norms” (2005:2).¶ As I suggested in referencing the role of statistics and techniques for pooling risk in the creation of social democratic welfare states, social technologies need not have any essential or eternal loyalty to the political formations within which they were first developed. Insurance rationality at the end of the nineteenth century had no essential vocation to provide security and solidarity to the working class; it was turned to that purpose (in some substantial measure) because it was available, in the right place at the right time, to be appropriated for that use. Specific ways of solving or posing governmental problems, specific institutional and intellectual mechanisms, can be combined in an almost infinite variety of ways, to accomplish different social ends. With social, as with any other sort of technology, it is not the machines or the mechanisms that decide what they will be used to do.¶ Foucault (2008:94) concluded his discussion of socialist governmentality by insisting that the answers to the Left’s governmental problems require not yet another search through our sacred texts, but a process of conceptual and institutional innovation. “[I]f there is a really socialist governmentality, then it is
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not hidden within socialism and its texts. It cannot be deduced from them. It must be invented”. But invention in the domain of governmental technique is rarely something worked up out of whole cloth. More often, it involves a kind of bricolage (Le ́vi- Strauss 1966), a piecing together of something new out of scavenged parts originally intended for some other purpose. As we pursue such a process of improvisatory invention, we might begin by making an inventory of the parts available for such tinkering, keeping all the while an open mind about how different mechanisms might be put to work, and what kinds of purposes they might serve. If we can go beyond seeing in “neoliberalism” an evil essence or an automatic unity, and instead learn to see a field of specific governmental techniques, we may be surprised to find that some of them can be repurposed, and put to work in the service of political projects very different from those usually associated with that word. If so, we may find that the cabinet of governmental arts available to us is a bit less bare than first appeared, and that some rather useful little mechanisms may be nearer to hand than we thought.

### Alt Fails: Utopianism

#### Frame the alternative within consequentialism – neoliberalism is most ethical because all *practical* alternatives are utopian or cause violence.

Richards 9

Jay Richards, PhD with honors in Philosophy and Theology from Princeton, “Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism Is the Solution and Not the Problem,” pg. 31-32

Myth no. 1: The Nirvana Myth (contrasting capitalism with an unrealizable ideal rather than with its live alternatives) But the myth can have subtle effects even if we reject utopian schemes. To avoid its dangers, we have to resist the temptation to compare our live options with an ideal that we can never realize. When we ask whether we can build a just society, we need to keep the question nailed to solid ground: just compared with what? It doesn’t do anyone any good to tear down a society that is “unjust” compared with the kingdom of God if that society is more just than any of the ones that will replace it. Compared with Nirvana, no real society looks good. Compared with utopia, Stalinist Russia and America at its best will both get bad reviews. The differences between them may seem trivial compared to utopia. That’s one of the grave dangers of utopian thinking: it blinds us to the important differences among the various ways of ordering society. The Nirvana Myth dazzles the eyes, to the point that the real alternatives all seem like dull and barely distinguishable shades of gray. The free exchange of wages for work in the marketplace starts to look like slavery. Tough competition for market share between companies is confused with theft and survival of the fittest. Banking is confused with usury and exploitation. This shouldn’t surprise us. Of course a modern capitalist society like the United States looks terrible compared with the kingdom of God. But that’s bad moral reasoning. The question isn’t whether capitalism measures up to the kingdom of God. The question is whether there’s a better alternative in this life. “Those who condemn the immorality of liberal capitalism do so in comparison with a society of saints that has never existed—and never will.” —Martin Wolf, Why Globalization Works If we’re going to compare modern capitalism with an extreme, we should compare it with a real extreme—like communism in Cambodia, China, or the Soviet Union. Unlike Nirvana, these experiments are well within our power to bring about. They all reveal the terrible cost of trying to create a society in which ev- eryone is economically equal. If we insist on comparing live options with live options, modern capitalism could hardly be more different, more just, or more desirable than such an outcome. That doesn’t mean we should rest on our laurels. It means we need to stay focused on reality rather than romantic ideals. So how should we answer the question that began this chap- ter: can’t we build a just society? The answer: we should do everything we can to build a more just society and a more just world. And the worst way to do that is to try to create an egalitarian utopia.

### Alt Fails: Transition Wars

#### Transition from neolib causes massive violence – counter-revolutionary interventions

Anderson ’84 (Perry, professor of sociology – UCLA, “In the tracks of historical materialism,” p. 102-103)

That background also indicates, however, what is essentially missing from his work. How are we to get from where we are today to where he point us to tomorrow? There is no answer to this question in Nove. His halting discussion of “transition” tails away into apprehensive admonitions to moderation to the British Labor Party, and pleas for proper compensation to capitalist owners of major industries, if these are to be nationalized. Nowhere is there any sense of what a titanic political change would have to occur, with what fierceness of social struggle, for the economic model of socialism he advocates ever to materialize. Between the radicalism of the future end-state he envisages, and the conservatism of the present measures he is prepared to countenance, there is an unbridgeable abyss. How could private ownership of the means of production ever be abolished by policies less disrespectful of capital than those of Allende or a Benn, which he reproves? What has disappeared from the pages of The Economics of Feasible Socialism is virtually all attention to the historical dynamics of any serious conflict over the control of the means of production, as the record of the 20th century demonstrates them. If capital could visit such destruction on even so poor and small an outlying province of its empire in Vietnam, to prevent its loss, is it likely that it would suffer its extinction meekly in its own homeland? The lessons of the past sixty-five years or so are in this respect without ambiguity or exception, there is no case, from Russia to China, from Vietnam to Cuba, from Chile to Nicaragua, where the existence of capitalism has been challenged, and the furies of intervention, blockade and civil strife have not descended in response. Any viable transition to socialism in the West must seek to curtail that pattern: but to shrink from or to ignore it is to depart from the world of the possible altogether. In the same way, to construct an economic model of socialism in one advanced country is a legitimate exercise: but to extract it from any computable relationship with a surrounding, and necessarily opposing, capitalist environment—as this work does—is to locate it in thin air.

### Alt Fails: Rejection Bad

#### Lack of specific action means the alt will fail.

Jones 11 (Owen, Masters at Oxford, named one of the Daily Telegraph's 'Top 100 Most Influential People on the Left' for 2011, author of "Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class", The Independent, UK, "Owen Jones: Protest without politics will change nothing", 2011, www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/owen-jones-protest-without-politics-will-change-nothing-2373612.html)

Today, as protesters in nearly a thousand cities across the world follow the example set by the Occupy Wall Street protests, it's worth pondering what happened to the anti-globalisation movement. Its activists did not lack passion or determination. But they did lack a coherent alternative to the neo-liberal project. With no clear political direction, the movement was easily swept away by the jingoism and turmoil that followed 9/11, just two months after Genoa. Don't get me wrong: the Occupy movement is a glimmer of sanity amid today's economic madness. By descending on the West's financial epicentres, it reminds us of how a crisis caused by the banks (a sentence that needs to be repeated until it becomes a cliché) has been cynically transformed into a crisis of public spending. The founding statement of Occupy London puts it succinctly: "We refuse to pay for the banks' crisis." The Occupiers direct their fire at the top 1 per cent, and rightly so – as US billionaire Warren Buffett confessed: "There's class warfare, all right, but it's my class, the rich class, that's making war, and we're winning." The Occupy movement has provoked fury from senior US Republicans such as Presidential contender Herman Cain who – predictably – labelled it "anti-American". They're right to be worried: those camping outside banks threaten to refocus attention on the real villains, and to act as a catalyst for wider dissent. But a coherent alternative to the tottering global economic order remains, it seems, as distant as ever. Neo-liberalism crashes around, half-dead, with no-one to administer the killer blow. There's always a presumption that a crisis of capitalism is good news for the left. Yet in the Great Depression, fascism consumed much of Europe. The economic crisis of the 1970s did lead to a resurgence of radicalism on both left and right. But, spearheaded by Thatcherism and Reaganism, the New Right definitively crushed its opposition in the 1980s.This time round, there doesn't even seem to be an alternative for the right to defeat. That's not the fault of the protesters. In truth, the left has never recovered from being virtually smothered out of existence. It was the victim of a perfect storm: the rise of the New Right; neo-liberal globalisation; and the repeated defeats suffered by the trade union movement. But, above all, it was the aftermath of the collapse of Communism that did for the left. As US neo-conservative Midge Decter triumphantly put it: "It's time to say: We've won. Goodbye." From the British Labour Party to the African National Congress, left-wing movements across the world hurtled to the right in an almost synchronised fashion. It was as though the left wing of the global political spectrum had been sliced off. That's why, although we live in an age of revolt, there remains no left to give it direction and purpose.

### Cap Good: War (1/2)

#### Capitalism prevents war and has historically caused the largest reductions in poverty and inequality – any other argument ignores empirics and robust economic models

Weede 08 (Erich, professor at the Institute for Political Science and Sociology, “Globalization and Inequality” Comparative Sociology 7, p. 415-433)

Globalization refers to an increasing international division of labor and more trade between economies, to cross-border investment and rapid transfers of technology between nations, to global capital ﬂows and, to a lesser degree, to increasing labor mobility. There is as yet no global labor market. Globalization also implies better opportunities to learn from foreigners or strangers. The more similar you are to others, the less likely it is that you can learn from them.1 Unfortunately, many people prefer to rely on established routines and resent the challenge of having to learn from others. Globalization is another word for a worldwide expansion of capitalism. It results in international tax competition (Edwards and de Rugy 2002; Mitchell 2005). Globalization is based on some technological and political prerequisites. These include ever cheaper and faster means of communication and transportation as well as an adequate political environment. The global expansion of capitalism requires political fragmentation: markets should be larger than political units.2 This provides an exit option from oppressive government for capital and, to a lesser degree, for qualiﬁed labor. Such an exit option protects economic freedom from ever-increasing state interference and tax burdens. If one state should be much more powerful than all others, as the US currently is, then globalization requires a deeper commitment to capitalism and economic freedom by the hegemon than by other states. Th ese political requirements of globalization are fulﬁlled. Globalization maximizes the size of the market. Since Adam Smith (1776/1976) we know that the size of the market determines the degree of division of labor which promotes productivity. Thus, globalization is beneﬁcial because it increases productivity. This is not only a theoretical claim, but also an empirical statement. For instance, based on data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, yearly economic gains from globalization have been estimated to be somewhere between $1,650 and $3,300 per capita for Americans (Scheve and Slaughter 2007:36–37). Real compensation per hour (including beneﬁts and wages) has also gone up in the past decade, by 22 percent (Griswold 2007:1).3 Since Deng Xiaoping opened China in the late 1970s by introducing reforms which imply creeping capitalism, Chinese agricultural production grew rapidly. Later, China attracted a lot of foreign direct investment. Today China is a major base for manufacturing. By 2005 it was already the third largest exporter, still behind Germany and the US but already ahead of Japan (Th e Economist 2005). By 2008 China is likely to become the biggest exporter in the world. In the early 1980s (but no longer thereafter) even the disparity between urban and rural incomes in China decreased (Lin, Cai, and Li 2003:145). Hundreds of millions of Chinese were taken out of abject poverty. In the ﬁrst two decades of reform, per capita incomes grew fourfold (Bhalla 2002:218). Later, less radical reforms in India led to nearly doubling per capita incomes in a similar period of time and pulled about two hundred million Indians out of abject poverty (Das 2002:360). Since China and India together account for nearly forty percent of mankind and about half of the population living in less developed countries, economic growth in China and India and other Asian countries contributes to the equalization of the global distributions of income between individuals and households. If we are interested in individuals rather than states, then the empirical indicators are clear. Globalization or the global expansion of capitalism has contributed to, or at least been compatible with, an equalization of the size distribution of income between human beings. Since cross-national differences between average incomes are still a more important component of inequality between human beings than intra-national differences in income, it is possible – and currently true – to have the following two trajectories at the same time: growing inequality within many or even most countries amidst some movement towards equality among individuals worldwide (Bhalla 2002; Firebaugh 1999; Goesling 2001; Sala-i-Martin 2007; World Bank 2005). Admittedly, many economies, including the US and China, suffered some deterioration in their domestic income distributions. This is why the legitimacy of capitalism and globalization comes under attack, even in the American citadel of capitalism. This is also why calls for protectionism become louder and louder (Scheve and Slaughter 2007). But critics of globalization tend to forget a basic truth about free trade (Griswold 2007:3): “If workers, capital, and resources can shift within the domestic economy, jobs eliminated by import competition will quickly be replaced by jobs created elsewhere.”4 One should not blame the consequences of institutional sclerosis, or of an unwillingness to adjust, on globalization.  Globalization has led to a significant reduction in mass poverty. Although the Chinese distribution of income has become much less equal since the reform process began in the late 1970s, the strong growth performance of China has pulled hundreds of millions out of abject poverty. In India growth has been less spectacular than in China such that the distribution of income has changed less, and yet again hundreds of millions have been pulled out of abject poverty. Although Latin America and Africa have benefitted much less from globalization than Asia has, these continents also cannot match the demographic weight of Asia. Therefore, their comparative lack of success cannot neutralize Asian progress in global perspective. Moreover, one has to keep in mind that winning in the process of globalization presupposes participating in it, not abstaining from it. One may illustrate global change with data

### Cap Good: War (2/2)

provided by Indian economist Surjit Bhalla (2002:187). He deﬁnes people with a daily income between $10–$40 USD as members of the global middle class. In 1960 this class consisted largely of whites; only six percent were Asians. By 2000, however, 52 percent was Asian. Th e era of globalization is one in which Asia is now recovering, after falling for about two centuries further behind the West. Except for Africa abject poverty worldwide is likely to become signiﬁcantly reduced within one or two decades. Th e African share of abject poverty in the world is expected to rise until 2015 from 36 percent to about 90 percent (Bhalla 2002:S. 172).5 Why did so many people in Asia beneﬁt from globalization, whereas Africans did not? A plausible explanation has been oﬀered by Collier (2007:79).6 He points out that about three quarters of the bottom billion7 live in countries which have suﬀered from civil war or long periods of bad governance and poor economic policies. According to Collier (2007:27), “civil war is development in reverse. It damages both the country itself and its neighbors.” Bad governance and poor economic policies distort incentives and misallocate the meager resources of poor countries. Africa has suﬀered from these development traps to a greater degree than other continents. Moreover, one may argue that a focus on income and income distributions is biased towards understating the beneﬁts of globalization. As Goklany (2007:chaps. 2–3) has pointed out, the same income per capita today (in terms of purchasing power) implies higher life expectancies, lower infant mortalities, less malnutrition, healthier lives, and less child labor than it did decades or centuries earlier. Less developed, still poor countries do benefit from the technological progress achieved by developed and rich countries. Thus, even if one disputes the widely held and well-supported view regarding some equalization of individual or house-hold incomes worldwide in recent decades, one should still accept Goklany’s contention (2007:72): “In the aspects of human well-being that are truly critical – life expectancy, infant mortality, hunger, literacy, and child labor – the world is far more equal today than it was a century ago, in large part because of globalization.”8  Another advantage of globalization is that it contributes to preventing war (Russett and Oneal 2001; Weede 2005). Quantitative research demonstrates that the risk of war between nations is reduced if they trade a lot with each other. There is something like a commercial peace or peace by trade. Moreover, economic freedom reduces involvement in military conﬂict and ﬁnancial market openness also reduces the risk of war (Gartzke 2005, 2007). In particular, I want to underline that economic cooperation paciﬁes the geopolitical relationship between rising China and the West.9   Moreover, there is also something like a democratic peace. The risk of war between democracies is extremely small. In my view, one should conceptualize this as a component of a capitalist peace because democracies prosper best in wealthy countries10 and because capitalism or economic freedom and thereby globalization contribute to prosperity (Weede 2005, 2006). Since rising powers tend to challenge the political status quo, it is fortunate that the two demographic giants of this world seem to prosper under global capitalism/

### Cap Good: Environment

#### Rejecting capitalism causes massive ecological disasters – turns the K.

Butters ‘7 **(Roger B., Ph.D., President – Nebraska Council on Economic Education, Assistant Professor of Economics – University of Nebraska at Lincoln, “Teaching the Benefits of Capitalism”,** [**http://www.hillsdale.edu/images/userImages/afolsom/Page\_6281/Butters.pdf**](http://www.hillsdale.edu/images/userImages/afolsom/Page_6281/Butters.pdf)**)**

Property rights create the incentive needed to conserve scarce resources. Why is the air outside polluted and the air in your car clean? The answer is property rights. You don’t own the air outside your car so you gladly pollute it whereas the air inside your car, over which you have a property right, is jealously maintained with air‐conditioning, filters and air fresheners. How can we solve the pollution problem? Simple, establish a property right and require that all exhaust fumes be vented inside the vehicle that creates them. Suddenly the incentive to use better fuels, drive a more efficient vehicle and reduce emissions would result in booming innovation in pollution abatement; all in response to a property right. Clearly this example pushes into the absurd, but it illustrate the point none‐the‐less. For a more practical comparison consider why private bathrooms are clean, and public ones are not. Better yet, why are Maine Lobsters plentiful and orange roughy aren’t? – Property rights. Why are cows thriving and tigers vanishing? Property rights. For cows people have a direct incentive to preserve, protect and improve. For tigers the only incentive is to use the resource before someone else does. Why are elephants and other endangered species on the rebound in some African countries? Property rights. By letting villages own the animals they have an incentive to preserve, protect and improve, and as a result the animals are thriving. Rather than calling poachers when a rhinoceros decimates your corn field, you care for the animal, make sure it has several young and then auction the right to shoot it to a wealthy game hunter. The animals are preserved, the population is maintained, the village receives increased wealth and a private individual has a unique experience. By defining the property right we have gone from extinction and poverty to trade and wealth and at the end of the day there are more, not fewer rhinoceroses. The tragedy of the commons is one of the most valuable and pervasive examples of what happens when property rights are poorly defined and unenforced. What is the benefit of capitalism? It provides us with property rights that create the incentives to preserve, protect and improve. It is not surprising that the greatest ecological disasters have all occurred in societies without strong social institutions that protect property.